

REMARKS

Prior to this Amendment, claims 35, 36, 38-43 and 45-66 were pending in the application. In the present response, the Applicant has cancelled claims 42-43, 45-51, 53-54 and 61-66 and amended claims 35 and 55. Accordingly, claims 35, 36, 38-41, 52 and 55-60 are pending in the application.

In the Official Action mailed August 11, 2004, the Examiner rejected claims 35, 36, 38-43, 45-54 and 55-66 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Further, the Examiner rejected claims 42, 43, 45-54 and 61-66 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated or under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 4,875,032 to McManus. However, the Examiner indicated that claims 35-36, 38-41, 52 and 55-60 would be allowable if amended to cure the deficiencies noted in the rejection under Section 112, first paragraph. Accordingly, in view of the allowable subject matter, the Applicant has amended the claims to place them in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above-referenced application in view of the remarks and amendments set forth below.

In the rejection under Section 112, first paragraph, the Examiner asserted that claims 35, 42 and 49 recite “a color display device that stores color correction data in an unused portion in a standard memory associated therewith,” which is not described in the specification. Despite this assertion, however, the Examiner indicated that the claims may be amended to overcome the rejection. Accordingly, as suggested by the Examiner, the Applicant has amended claim 35 to replace the phrase “an unused portion in a standard memory” with “a memory.” Further, because claims 36, 38-41 and 52 depend from independent claim 35, these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance.

Therefore, the Applicant also respectfully requests that the Examiner pass the above-referenced application to issue with claims 36, 38-41 and 52.


In addition, in the rejection under Section 112, first paragraph, the Examiner asserted that claims 55-60 recite a “Display Data Channel (“DDC”),” which is not specifically defined in the specification. Again, despite this assertion, the Examiner indicated that the claims may be amended to overcome these rejections. Accordingly, as suggested by the Examiner, the Applicant has amended claim 55 to replace the phrase “Display Data Channel (“DDC”) memory” with the phrase “memory.” Also, because claims 56-60 depend from independent claim 55, these claims are also believed to be in condition for allowance. Therefore, the Applicant also respectfully requests that the Examiner pass the above-referenced application to issue with claims 55-60.

Conclusion

In view of the remarks and amendments set forth above, the Applicant respectfully requests allowance of the pending claims 35-36, 38-41, 52 and 55-60. If the Examiner believes that a telephonic interview will help speed this application toward issuance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 4, 2004



Brent R. Knight
Reg. No. 54,226
(281) 970-4545

Correspondence Address:
Hewlett-Packard Company
IP Administration
Legal Department, M/S 35
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400